Developing Japanese-English bilinguals' translanguaging abilities through dialogue interpreting tasks

Kenta KOSHIBA

Abstract

This paper explores the effectiveness of dialogue interpreting tasks as a means of developing bilingual learners' translanguaging abilities: the flexible and creative use of bilingual resources. To this end, it examines how three Japanese-English bilingual learners engaged in dialogue interpreting tasks, which they undertook as part of their secondary school advanced-level Japanese language class. By analysing transcribed video-recordings of the activity and data collected through stimulated recall interviews, this paper shows that the dialogue interpreting tasks provided the students with the opportunity to translanguage, to reflect on when to use it, and to translanguage to mediate understanding. The paper thus argues that dialogue interpreting tasks may be an effective way of engaging these learners with translanguaging in oral communicative settings.

Keywords: Translanguaging, Japanese, interpreting and translation, heritage learners, classroom tasks

1. INTRODUCTION

For a long time, in language classrooms, bilingual students' mixing of their L1 and L2 was often considered a case of interference, and symptomatic of their inability to keep the languages apart (see V. Cook, 1999 for a detailed discussion). Underlining this view was the idea that languages were discreet sets of codes, and that languages existed separately in society and in the mind. However, we now know that this reified view of languages is a product of social and political movements (Makoni & Pennycook, 2005), and thus more ideological than reflective of how language actually works. Today, a bilingual's ability to shuttle flexibly between their L1 and L2 is seen instead as a case of translanguaging (García, 2009; García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Li Wei, 2014).

In fact, studies have shown that bilinguals, whether emergent or advanced, are natural translanguagers, who "translanguage constantly to co-construct meaning, to include others, and to mediate understanding" (García, 2009, p. 304). This, however, also raises a critical question: if translanguaging is indeed a natural ability, what scope is there, if at all, for pedagogy to further improve it (Canagarajah, 2011b)? What kind of classroom tasks may leverage all the features of a bilingual's repertoire "while also showing them when, with whom, where, and why to use some features of

their repertoire and not others, enabling them to also perform according to the social norms of named languages as used in schools" (García & Kleyn, 2016, p. 15)?

This paper explores one possible solution to this question: dialogue interpreting tasks. To this end, it examines how three Japanese-English bilinguals engaged in dialogue interpreting tasks, which they undertook as part of their secondary school advanced-level Japanese language class. By analysing audio recordings of their interpreting performance and data collected through stimulated recall interviews, this paper shows that the bilingual and communicative nature of the task provided the students with opportunities to use dependent and independent translanguaging (García & Kano, 2014), to reflect on when to use them, and to think about how their translanguaging would be understood by others. The paper thus argues that dialogue interpreting tasks may indeed be an effective way of developing the translanguaging abilities of advance-level bilinguals in oral interactions.

2. THE CONCEPT OF TRANSLANGUAGING

The term translanguaging or *trawsieithu* was first introduced by Cen Williams, a Welsh educator, as a teaching approach that encourages students to alternate between their L1 and L2. For example, a student might read a text in one language, and then talk about it in another. This alternation, Williams originally argued, helps bilinguals develop their weaker language and gain a deeper and fuller understanding of the subject matter by prompting them to process the information before the output (Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012b). More recently, the meaning of the term has expanded to include the flexible use of bilingual resources by students and teachers. As Baker explains, "Translanguaging is the process of making meaning, shaping experiences, gaining understanding and knowledge through the use of two languages" (Baker, 2011, p. 288).

Central to this broader understanding of translanguaging is the idea that bilinguals do not have a separate competence for each language. Instead, they have a single competence—or, a "single integrated system" (Canagarajah, 2011a, p. 401)—that encompasses both of their languages. When bilinguals translanguage, they draw on resources in their bilingual repertoire and "soft assemble" (García & Kano, 2014, p. 260) them in ways that respond to the needs of the communicative situation. As Garcia and Kano (2014) write: "bilinguals call upon different social features in a seamless and complex network of multiple semiotic signs, as they adapt their languaging to suit the immediate task" (p. 261).

The concept has been instrumental in illuminating how an analyst's or a teacher's understanding of what constitutes two different codes or languages, may in fact constitute a unitary code from a bilingual's perspective, even if these codes appear far removed (Alvarez-Cáccamo, 1998). This view

has been a corrective against the structuralism in bilingual research, which has tended to impose the analyst's categorisation onto actors. Moreover, it has contributed to moving bilingualism into a more interpretive direction that prioritises how bilinguals actually see and use their languages (Auer, 1998).

Since its popularisation, the concept of translanguaging has been used by scholars to better understand the discursive practices that occur in bilingual classrooms. Studies have documented how bilingual students naturally translanguage. This type of translanguaging is called "pupil-directed translanguaging,"(Lewis, Jones, & Baker, 2012a, p. 665) and it can be used for a variety of purposes. For example, it can facilitate students' task management and task clarification (Storch & Wigglesworth, 2003), and it can be a way for students to co-construct understanding with each other without the intervention of the teacher (García & Li Wei, 2014). Furthermore it can also be a way for students to self-regulate their learning. They may, for example, use knowledge associated with their stronger language to organise ideas, provide glosses, and to retrieve words (Velasco & García, 2014).

It is not just the students who translanguage; teachers too may engage in "teacher-directed translanguaging" (Lewis et al., 2012a, p. 665). For example, Creese and Blackledge (2010) reported that in their study of a Gujarati complementary school in the UK, the teacher used a fluid mixture of English and Gujarati as a way to engage with a diverse audience who had varying competencies in those languages. Here, translanguaging was used as a way for the teacher to acknowledge the identities and bilingual resources that students and parents brought to the classroom. Similar findings can be found in Sayer's (2013) ethnographic study of a second-grade ESL (English as a Second Language) class in the US, involving 15 English-Spanish bilinguals. He showed that translanguaging between English, Spanish, and TexMex—a local vernacular form of Spanish—enabled the teacher and her students "to create discursive spaces that allow them to engage with the social meanings in school from their position as bilingual Latinos" (p. 84). Translanguaging by teachers can, therefore, function to validate students' linguistic resources and to create discursive spaces in which they can negotiate multilingual identities.

As it can be observed, studies point to both the academic and social benefits of translanguaging, which makes it imperative for teachers and scholars to develop a more systematic understanding of the phenomenon. However, as Canagarajah (2011b) points out, because translanguaging has often been seen as a naturally-occurring phenomenon—something that bilingual students and teachers simply know how to do—educators have not fully considered how they can make students better translanguagers, or to consider room for error:

> In most studies on translanguaging, whether inside or outside the classroom, researchers have

> focused mostly on the information transfer, pragmatic meanings and implications for cognitive competence. They haven't asked if the translanguaging is appropriate for that context in rhetorical terms. Could better choices have been adopted for more effective communication? (p. 9)

Thus to develop pedagogy that can consolidate students' ability to translanguage, Canagarajah (2011) argues that research must begin by exploring how students actually use translanguaging to solve problems.

3. THE USE OF TRANSLANGUAGING TASKS IN CLASSROOMS

Responding to this call, more recently, studies have attempted to more systematically understand how students translanguage, and to find ways of incorporating the idea into classroom tasks (see García & Kleyn, 2016; García & Li Wei, 2014). For example, García and Kano (2014) explored the use of translanguaging tasks in a class for Japanese students in the US, who were preparing to take the essay writing section of the Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT), which is used for university admission. The 10 students in the study—both emergent and experienced bilinguals—were given texts both in Japanese and in English to read in preparation to write their English essays. In both groups of students, the bilingual texts allowed them to reflect on the differences between English and Japanese and facilitated the writing of their own English essays. There were, however, differences in how each group used the texts. The experienced bilinguals tended to use "independent translanguaging" (García & Kano, 2014, p. 265) in which both languages were used as a way of enhancing one's performance. For example, these students picked out and combined the best information from both the Japanese and English texts when writing their English essays. In contrast, emergent bilinguals tended to use "dependent translanguaging" (García & Kano, 2014, p. 265) in which the stronger language was used to fill in gaps in the understanding of their weaker language. For instance, whenever they did not understand the English text, the students checked their comprehension by referring to the Japanese text.

Other studies also confirm the benefits of using bilingual texts as a way to engage students with translanguaging. For example, Ebe and Chapman-Santiago (2016) reported on the various ways that bilingual texts were used in an eighth-grade English Language Arts class, in which a majority of the students were English language learners from various linguistic backgrounds. They showed, for example, that providing task instructions in multiple languages clarified the aims of the task for the students, and helped them engage with it. They also showed that by having the students analyse excerpts from an English novel that employed translanguaging as a literary device (for example, the

author of the novel interspersed Vietnamese words in the English prose), they could bring students attention to their own translingual practices, and help them to reflect on how and why a person might choose to translanguage. These strategic uses of bilingual texts, the authors concluded, allowed the teacher to provide scaffolding for emergent bilingual students. This created an inclusive classroom environment conducive to translanguaging.

However, these studies along with others that explore the potentials of translanguaging tasks (for example, Canagarajah, 2011a; García & Kano, 2014; Michael-Luna & Canagarajah, 2007; Velasco & García, 2014) have tended to focus on translanguaging in the written modality. They thus tell us very little about the how bilinguals use translanguaging to solve problems in oral, interpersonal communications. Yet, when we consider how bilinguals and their translanguaging are embedded in sociohistorical circumstances filled with norms that designate what is "right" and "wrong", "correct," and "deviant" (Blommaert, 2010), it becomes crucial to also develop tasks that can help bilinguals foster their oral, interpersonal translanguaging skills. More specifically, this means raising their awareness towards how they use translanguaging, when they should or should not use it, and how they can use it effectively to mediate understanding in bilingual interactions.

It is here that interpreting—or oral forms of translation—may offer one possible way for addressing this need. A typical interpreting situation involves a bi-directional dialogue—or a triadic exchange (Mason, 2001)—between two primary interlocutors who speak different languages (for example, an English-speaking doctor and a Japanese-speaking patient). When a speaker finishes his or her utterance in one language, the interpreter must interpret it into the other language, and vice-versa. This movement requires a person to draw on the full ranges of bilingual resources that he/she has at their disposal, both in the input and output stages. It thus shares many similarities with translanguaging.

It should be noted that interpreting and translanguaging contrast with translation, which involves a person converting a text written in one language into a comparable text in another. Translation usually occurs uni-directionally and it "tends to separate languages, emphasising that one language is preferred academically even if it is temporarily the weaker language" (Lewis et al., 2012a, p. 660). Indeed, when teachers use translation is classrooms, they often do so to provide a scaffold for emergent bilinguals, who may need instruction in their stronger language (Lewis et al., 2012a). Translation thus lacks the bi-directionality that characterises translanguaging and interpreting.

However, despite these parallels, interpreting has yet to receive attention as a classroom task. This may be partly due to its similarity with translation, which has often been associated with the Grammar Translation Method and sidelined as an out-dated pedagogical approach (G. Cook, 2010). It may also be due to the popular perception that interpreting is a specialised and vocational skill that

has very little to do with language education. Yet, in recent years, there has been a revitalised interest in translation as a dynamic task that engages students with linguistic and cultural differences (for example, Carreres & Noriega-Sánchez, 2011; Källkvist, 2013; Takimoto & Hashimoto, 2010). Taking this into consideration, and especially in the light of recent developments in translanguaging research described above, interpreting may also be a candidate for re-evaluation.

4. METHODOLOGY

4.1 Setting and participants

To explore how students use translanguaging to engage with dialogue interpreting tasks, and to examine whether such tasks have the potential to develop their translanguaging abilities, this paper draws from a case study that involved three Japanese-English bilinguals living in Australia. They either had a Japanese parent or a home-background in Japanese, and they were all enrolled in an advanced-level Japanese language class for heritage learners. While the variability in the home language ability of heritage learners is well documented (for example, Kondo-Brown, 2005), all of these students were in the advanced or experienced end of the bilingual spectrum. While Takeshi and John reported English to be their stronger language, all three of them used Japanese at home when communicating with family members, Moreover, they reported that they felt comfortable using Japanese to engage in most daily tasks—attested by their choice to use the language with the researcher throughout the study. Their profiles are given in the table below:

Table 1 Students' profiles

	Age	Sex	Father's background	Mother's background	Age of migration	Education in Japan	Japanese Saturday School
Takeshi	18	M	Australia	Japanese	Born in Australia	None	10 years (age 4–14)
John	17	M	Australia	Japanese	3	None	8 years (age 6–14)
Teru	17	M	Chinese	Chinese (Hong Kong)	11	5 years	5 years (age 12–17)

4.2 Interpreting role-play tasks

As part of their course, these students undertook a dialogue interpreting task. For this task, the students were put into a group and given three different 10-minute dialogue scripts to act out (see Appendix for a sample of the dialogue scripts). These dialogues were taken and adapted from a book

called *Community Language Interpreting: A Workbook* (Lee & Buzo, 2009) and featured a typical dialogue interpreting situations in the Australian context:

1) A teacher talking to a parent about how his son had stolen an iPod from another student (Interpreter: Teru)
2) A parent-teacher interview in which a teacher is talking to a parent who is concerned about his daughter's grades (Interpreter: Takeshi)
3) A doctor-patient consultation in which the doctor is trying to diagnose a patient who is feeling unwell. (Interpreter: John)

The teacher/doctor was the English speaker and the parent/patient was the Japanese speaker. One student acted as the English speaker, one student acted as the Japanese speaker, and one student was the interpreter. The interpreting student was not permitted to look at the script in order to simulate a real interpreting situation. Midway through the dialogue, the students were asked to switch roles so that everyone had a chance to act as the interpreter. The students' actual interpretations were video-recorded and transcribed for data analysis. Translations of the students' Japanese interpretations are provided in italics. In these translations, words in bold font indicate that they were said in English. Moreover, they are translated as faithfully as possible to give the reader an idea of the original utterance.

4.3 Stimulated recall interviews

Since a large part of the interpreting processes is invisible, a stimulated recall interview, or follow-up interview (Neustupný, 1990), was also conducted in Japanese with each student after the interpreting task. The main aim of these interviews was to elicit information regarding the internal processes and strategies that the students utilised during the interpreting task (Gass & Mackey, 2000, 2007; Neustupný, 1990). The video-recordings of the students' interpreting performances were played back and the students were invited to comment on how they engaged with the task, including what they were thinking, why they used certain words, which language they felt more comfortable in, and so on.

While all measures were taken to conduct the stimulated recall interviews as soon as possible after the actual task to minimise the information loss (Dörnyei, 2007), due to time constraints, there were delays anywhere between one to four days between the activity and the actual stimulated recall interview, which may have had an influence on the data. The stimulated recall interviews were also recorded, transcribed, and translated into English. The data shown below is drawn both from

the interviews and from the students' actual interpreting performances. Hereafter, the word "interpretation" is used to refer to the product of the students' oral translation, rather than to the conventional meaning of the term (i.e. an explanation).

5. FINDINGS

5.1 Problem solving with translanguaging

On first glance, in the youths' interpreting performances, there were only a few instances in which both Japanese and English were used in the same utterance. This was probably due to the high level of bilingual competence these students had, which made it possible for them to produce monolingual interpretations that were in keeping with the monolingual norm of interpreting. Furthermore, despite reporting that they had very little prior experience, the students' comments revealed that much of the interpreting process was automatic and required little critical reflection. To these students who had grown up in bilingual environments, the flexible, alternating use of Japanese and English seemed to come naturally.

However, a closer examination of the data revealed that this apparent ease was a product of the students' use of translanguaging, which helped them solve problems they encountered during the task. For example, we can observe the use of a dependent translanguaging in the following extract from Teru's stimulated recall interview. When he was asked which language he was using to take notes of what the interlocutors said, he responded:

Extract 1

Interviewer:	Which language did you take the notes in?
Teru:	All of it in Japanese.
Interviewer:	When you're listening in Japanese and when you're listening in English?
Teru:	Umm, yeah, I wrote everything in Japanese.

Teru arrived in Australia at the age of 11 years and therefore may have lacked confidence in English, relative to the other students. His use of Japanese—his self-reported stronger language—to take notes could have been a way to make up for his perceived weakness in English. By using his stronger language to take notes and listen to the speakers, it allowed him to retain the information better, and made it easier to reproduce the information in his interpretation. His Japanese resources were used as scaffolding, which helped Teru fill gaps in his weaker language.

In another case, we can observe Takeshi's use of independent translanguaging to enhance his per-

formance. In the stimulated recall interview, when Takeshi was asked how he processed the bilingual input, he commented as follows:

Extract 2

> [Usually,] when I speak to an English speaker, I think in English, and when I speak to a Japanese-speaker, I think in Japanese, but interpreting is the opposite. When I'm listening to English, I think in Japanese, and when I'm listening to Japanese, I think in English […] When you think in English it's easier to say things in English. And it's the same for Japanese.

Unlike Teru in Extract 1 above, Takeshi utilised the target language (i.e. the language he was expected to interpret into) to process what the speakers said. By thinking beforehand in the language of production, he could reduce his cognitive load when actually giving the interpretation, and thereby provide a more fluent delivery. Takeshi, therefore, used his bilingual resources flexibly to enhance, rather than to support, his performance.

A similar kind of independent translanguaging was also used to solve problems. For example, in the following extract, Teru was the interpreter in the parent-teacher interview dialogue. Prior to this segment, the English-speaking teacher had explained to the Japanese-speaking parent about how his son stole a classmate's iPod. In the first line shown here, the teacher asked the parent for possible explanations for this behaviour. The teacher used the metaphorical phrase "can you shed any light on," which posed a challenge to Teru. The numbers in the parentheses indicate the length of pauses in seconds.

Extract 3

Teacher:	Can you shed any light on this type of behaviour?
Teru:	なんか（2.2）ほかに，違う，なんか，これを（11.2）あの，ほかになんかやっていない，あなたの息子がやっていない，ええと，（4.5）evidence じゃなくて証拠（*shōko*）とかありますか？
[Back translation]:	*So, (2.2) is there any other, no, so, this (11.2) um is there any other, that your son didn't do it, umm (4.5)* **evidence**, *I mean is there evidence* (*shōko*)*?*

We can see from the long pause at the beginning of Teru's line that he was searching for an appropriate interpretation of the metaphor, but without much success. However, after the pause, we can see him switching strategies. He paraphrased the metaphor in the same language by retrieving the word "evidence" from his English repertoire, which became a springboard for him to derive the Jap-

anese equivalent *shōko*. Teru thus flexibly drew on his bilingual repertoire to extend his communicative ability and to explicate the metaphor to better communicate with the interlocutors. At the same time, by quickly self-correcting his verbalisation of the English word "evidence," he showed an awareness of the monolingual norms of the situation.

5.2 Reflecting on when and when not to translanguage

There were also instances in which the students engaged with the question of when or when not to translanguage. That is to say, the face-to-face nature of the interpreting task made the interaction fast and spontaneous, which meant that lapses in the communication were costly in terms of the interpersonal dynamics. The students, therefore, needed to be conscious of the temporal element of the interaction. In some cases, translanguaging—flexibly and simultaneously using one's bilingual resources to solve problems—was not the best strategy to pursue, because of the time it took and the heavy cognitive load.

Indeed, we can see that the live nature of the interpreting task put a lot of pressure on the students. It is possible to observe this in the following extract from Teru's interpreting performance. Below, the English-speaking teacher explained to the Japanese-speaking parent why the parent-teacher interview had been arranged. Teru had to alternate languages while also remembering a large amount of information. Overwhelmed by the task, he inadvertently forgot to interpret, beginning his interpretation in English, the same language as the teacher:

Extract 4

Teacher:	The situation was that he and another student were caught in the act of going through the bag of another student. The other student had already put the iPod player in his pocket when the teacher spotted them.
Teru:	Well this happened, あの，この状況を説明しますと，先生は彼と彼の友達が，友達のバッグを探っているのを先生が見つけました。先生が来た時にはあなたの息子はiPodをポケットに入れていました。
[Back translation]:	**Well this happened**, *um, to give you an explanation of the situation, the teacher found him and his friend looking through the bag of another friend. By the time the teacher came, your son had already pocketed the iPod.*

When he was asked in the stimulated recall interview why this had happened, Teru recalled that it was because of the volume of information he had to process. He explained: "Well, the amount was too much, so I accidentally started [the interpretation] in English." However, after this "mistake,"

Teru adopted an alternative strategy: deciding not to translanguage. He decided simply to find corresponding words in the other language, and connect them to create an acceptable interpretation. That is to say, he opted to keep the languages separate and avoid thinking simultaneously in both languages. In the following extract from Teru's stimulated recall interview, he explained that he made this choice because of the speed of the interaction and the strain that it put on his linguistic ability. Takeshi is mentioned because he was acting as the English-speaking teacher.

Extract 5

> Takeshi spoke very fast, so I tried to grasp as much as I can and talk by connecting them. That's because when I tried to interpret what Takeshi was saying, there was so much, and when I tried to say all of it, it turned out to be a mess.

The interpretation that resulted from this alternative strategy was, as Teru admitted, not a complete rendition of what the original speaker had said. However, for him, this acceptable translation was better than the "mess" that resulted from trying to effectively draw on both of his linguistic resources to accurately communicate the speaker's intent. By choosing to replace the words in a mechanical way, Teru could keep the conversation going, and possibly achieve the interlocutors' communicative goals.

As Teru's example above showed, it seemed that deciding not to use translanguaging strategies was just as important as deciding to use them to solve problems. Takeshi also reported similar strategies regarding his interpretation of a segment in the parent-teacher interview dialogue, which involved an English-speaking teacher and a Japanese-speaking parent. The exchange took place early in the dialogue, and began with the parent thanking the teacher for agreeing to the interview:

Extract 6

Parent:	今日はお忙しいところお時間を作っていただきありがとうございます。実は娘のことで相談がありまして。おっしゃる通り娘の成績があまり良くないのですが，心配なんです。
[Translation]:	*Thank you for making the time despite your business. Actually, I wanted to consult you about my daughter. As you said, her grades aren't very good, and I'm worried.*
Takeshi:	Thank you for making the time for all of this today, about my daughter. As you say, I'm worried about my daughter's grade.

In the stimulated recall interview, when the video recording was played back to Takeshi, he explained that he interpreted the parent's greeting ("今日はお忙しいところお時間を作っていただきありがとうございます" [*Thank you for making the time despite your busyness*]) literally as "Thank you for making the time for all of this today":

Extract 7

> In this case, I translated directly. Well, to make time, and because the expression doesn't exist in English. And here, I felt that I wanted to keep it (the conversation) kind of going. Besides, I thought the message would get through anyway.

As it can be observed, even in situations where the students were aware of the existence of better, alternative interpretations, they had to weigh the positive communicative effect that the alternative could have, with the interactional dynamics that could be lost while they tried to come up with it. Here, Takeshi felt that the interactional dynamics took priority over linguistic accuracy. What this suggests is that while the interpreting task offered ample opportunities to solve problems by translanguaging (see Extract 1, 2 and 3), the students also had to monitor when it was and when it was not appropriate to do so. This decision-making entailed the students' accurate grasp of the situation, their awareness of the limitations of their cognitive capacity, and their assessment of whether or not a word or a phrase was important to the communicative goals of the interlocutors.

5.3 Mediating understanding with translanguaging

In addition, the students took on active roles in the conversation by using translanguaging to mediate understanding between the interlocutors. We can see this in Takeshi's interpretation of a segment in the same parent-teacher interview dialogue discussed above. In the following extract from this exchange, the English-speaking teacher asked the parent whether he had any idea why his daughter had all of a sudden lost interest in sports and acting—two of her favourite subjects:

Extract 8

Teacher:	Can you think of any reasons why she lost interest in these things?
Takeshi:	これらのことに興味を無くした原因とか見当がつきませんか？
[Back translation]:	*Can you venture a guess as to the reasons why she has lost interest in these things?*

In the stimulated recall interview, Takeshi reported that he intentionally utilised the word "見当"

[*to venture a guess*], explaining his strategy as follows:

Extract 9

> Well, after all, the teacher is a professional, so I thought I should use words that teachers would use. I mean, more professional words, so I can portray the teacher as a professional.

While the original utterance by the teacher did not contain any "professional" sounding words, Takeshi felt that he should emphasise the teacher's professionalism through his Japanese word choice, so that the seriousness of the situation and the social status of the teacher were communicated to the parent. He may have thought that this would assure the parent that the problem was in good, competent hands. Takeshi's interpretation thus involved not just a shuttling between linguistic resources, but also a shuttling between the sociocultural connotations that corresponding words had in each language. Takeshi flexibly used his bilingual repertoire, and adjusted his word choice in a way that fit the context of the interaction.

Attempts at mediation through translanguaging, however, were not always successful. Sometimes, the youths creatively drew on their bilingual resources, but the resultant interpretations were not optimal. This can be seen in the following extract taken from John's interpretation of the doctor-patient consultation. In the extract below, the English-speaking doctor tried to diagnose the cause of the Japanese-speaking patient's illness. The doctor inquired about the symptoms the patient was experiencing. John, as the interpreter, had to translate these symptoms into Japanese.

Extract 10

Doctor:	Have you also experienced any swelling?
John:	え，swelling, what the hell's swelling (6.1) スウェリング［suwelingu］とかおこりましたか？
[Back translation]:	*What,* **swelling, what the hell's swelling** (6.1) *did you have "suwelingu"?*
Doctor:	Anything like a rash?
John:	ええ，rash？ラッシュ［rasshu］とかはありましたか？
[Back translation]:	*Um,* **rash***, did you have a "rasshu"?*

From John's self talk in English, it is possible to see that he had no idea what "swelling" and "rash" were in Japanese. However, rather than mixing English into the Japanese utterance or ignoring the words all together, he drew on his phonetic knowledge of Japanese and applied them to the English words. In other words, he transliterated them into Japanese sounding words. "Swelling" and

"rash" became "suwelingu" and "rasshu," respectively.

The resultant interpretation was awkward, marked, and "wrong" from monolingual standards. If this had been a real doctor's consultation, the interpretation would have probably been incomprehensible to a Japanese-speaking patient. John's translanguaging was indeed creative and a sign of his ability to flexibly use his bilingual resources, but it did not produce a positive communicative outcome. However, we can also interpret his cross application of phonetic rules as an attempt, at the very least, to keep the conversation going. Rather than giving up and alienating the Japanese-speaking patient, he seemed to be using translanguaging to find a middle ground where understanding may possibly occur.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings explored above seem to suggest that the dialogue interpreting task did indeed prompt students to utilise the full range of their bilingual resources. Moreover, the stimulated recall interview revealed that both dependent and independent translanguaging were used in the students' performances. These strategies were used to provide a scaffold for the weaker language (see Extract 1), and to enhance the interpretation (see Extracts 2, 3, and 8). In these regards, interpreting tasks—like writing task examined in previous studies (for example, Canagarajah, 2011a; García & Kano, 2014; Velasco & García, 2014)—seemed to be an effective way of engaging students with translanguaging.

The findings also shed light on an aspect of the students' translanguaging that is not seen in previous studies that have focused on writing tasks. The students seemed to be making an active decision about whether or not to translanguage. In other words, the students sometimes appeared to use the whole range of their bilingual resources to solve problem, but at other times they seemed to simply search mechanically for lexical equivalents. This decision-making seemed to be prompted by the temporal element of the task. Unlike writing tasks, where students have some control over how much time to use within the limitations set by the teacher, the interpreting task was a live interaction. The students thus needed to provide their interpretations within a short time frame between the interlocutors' utterances (see Hale, 2007, p. 9). This meant that when the students were faced with a problem, they had to think about whether they should try to find a creative solution to it, or whether they should let it pass to keep the conversation going. The students thus had to adjust the *timing* of their translanguaging strategies in accordance with the whole verbal and non-verbal ecology of the situations. The interpreting task, therefore, appeared to provide an opportunity for the students to think not just about *how* to translanguage, but also about *when* to translanguage—a skill

that becomes important in interpersonal communicative settings outside of the classroom.

In addition, the findings also illuminate the students' reflection on the uptake of their translanguaging strategies. As Canagarajah (2011b) points out, often in studies on translanguaging in the written modality, it is difficult to observe whether students who translanguage are aware of how their strategies will be understood by others, or whether they are making an effort to be understood by their interlocutors. This may be because of the nature of written tasks, in which the recipient of the text is not co-present. By contrast, the interpreting task was dialogic, and the students could see immediately the consequences of their translanguaging strategies. Perhaps because of this face-to-face dynamic, we could observe Takeshi, for example, attempting to use his bilingual resources not just mechanically, but in a flexible way to maximize the effectiveness of the communication between the interlocutors (see Extract 7). Similarly, while John's attempts to translanguage was not successful in Extract 8 above, we can see his attempts to take into consideration the knowledge and linguistic resources that the interlocutors brought to the interaction.

These instances of translanguaging seemed to occur when the students were pushed in their roles as the interpreters to make the communication happen. Because they were interpreting between two monolingual speakers, they had to say something to keep the conversation going, even if there were words or phrases they could not immediately interpret into the other language. This meant that they could not resort to avoidance strategies, and had to creatively draw on their bilingual resources to find solutions. This problem solving involved the consideration of a wide array of factors, including the time constraints, interpersonal dynamics, the interactional goals, and the linguistic norms of the situation.

7. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study has explored how three advanced-level bilingual learners of Japanese engaged in an interpreting task, and examined the different ways in which they translanguaged. The analysis has shown how interpreting tasks appeared to effectively prompt the students to draw on and shuttle between their bilingual resources. It also showed how the tasks provided opportunities for students to reflect on the use of translanguaging in interactions, which simulated an environment outside the classroom. However, it should be noted that these students were advanced-level students who could, even without prior training, provide acceptable interpretations of relatively complex dialogues. Whether similar tasks could be applied to emergent bilinguals or to second language learners could be an inquiry that is worth pursuing in future studies.

REFERENCES

Alvarez-Cáccamo, C. (1998). From 'switching code' to 'code-switching': Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 29–50). New York, NY: Routledge.

Auer, P. (1998). Introduction: *Bilingual Conversation* revisited. In P. Auer (Ed.), *Code-switching in conversation: Language, interaction and identity* (pp. 1–24). New York, NY: Routledge.

Baker, C. (2011). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (5th ed.). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Blommaert, J. (2010). *The sociolinguistics of globalization*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Canagarajah, S. (2011a). Codemeshing in academic writing: Identifying teachable strategies of translanguaging. *The Modern Language Journal, 95*(iii), 401–417.

Canagarajah, S. (2011b). Translanguaging in the classroom: Emerging issues for research and pedagogy. *Applied Linguistics Review, 2*, 1–28.

Carreres, Á., & Noriega-Sánchez, M. (2011). Translation in language teaching: Insights from professional translator training. *The Language Learning Journal, 39*(3), 281–297.

Cook, G. (2010). *Translation in Language Teaching*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cook, V. (1999). Going beyond the native speaker in language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly, 33*(2), 185–209.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? *The Modern Language Journal, 94*(1), 103–115.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Ebe, A. E., & Chapman-Santiago, C. (2016). Student voices shining through: Exploring translanguaging as a literary device. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 57–82). New York, NY: Routledge.

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

García, O., & Kano, N. (2014). Translanguaging as process and pedagogy: Developing the English writing of Japanese students in the US. In J. Conteh & G. Meier (Eds.), *The multilingual turn in language education: Opportunities and challenges* (pp. 258–277). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

García, O., & Kleyn, T. (2016). Translanguaging theory in education. In O. García & T. Kleyn (Eds.), *Translanguaging with multilingual students: Learning from classroom moments* (pp. 9–33). New York, NY: Routledge.

García, O., & Li Wei. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2000). *Stimulated recall methodology in second language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gass, S. M., & Mackey, A. (2007). *Data elicitation for second and foreign language research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hale, S. B. (2007). *Community interpreting*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Källkvist, M. (2013). Language in translation tasks used in a university setting; Particular potential for student agency? *Modern Language Journal, 97*(1), 217–238.

Kondo-Brown, K. (2005). Difference in language skills: Heritage language learner subgroups and foreign language learners. *The Modern Language Journal, 89*(4), 563–581.

Lee, J., & Buzo, A. (2009). *Community language interpreting: A workbook*. Annandale, NSW: The Federation Press.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012a). Translanguaging: Developing its conceptualisation and contextualisation. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 655–670.

Lewis, G., Jones, B., & Baker, C. (2012b). Translanguaging: Origins and development from school to street and beyond. *Educational Research and Evaluation, 18*(7), 641–654.

Makoni, S., & Pennycook, A. (2005). Disinventing and (re)constituting languages. *Critical Inquiry in Language Studies, 2*(3), 137–156.

Mason, I. (Ed.) (2001). *Triadic exchanges: Studies in dialogue interpreting*. Machester, UK: St. Jerome Publishing.

Michael-Luna, S., & Canagarajah, S. (2007). Multilingual academic literacies: Pedagogical foundations for code meshing in primary and higher education. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Professional Practice, 4*(1), 55–77.

Neustupný, J. V. (1990). The follow-up interview. *Japanese Studies, 10*(2), 31–33.

Sayer, P. (2013). Translanguaging, TexMex, and bilingual pedagogy: Emergent bilinguals learning through the vernacular. *TESOL Quarterly, 47*(1), 63–88.

Storch, N., & Wigglesworth, G. (2003). Is there a role for the use of L1 in an L2 setting? *TESOL Quarterly, 37*(4), 760–770.

Takimoto, M., & Hashimoto, H. (2010). An "eye-opening" learning experience: Language learning through interpreting and translation. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 7*(1), 86–95.

Velasco, P., & García, O. (2014). Translanguaging and the writing of bilingual learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 37*(1), 6–23.

APPENDIX

Sample dialogue interpreting script (Extract)

Doctor: Good morning. What seems to be the trouble?
Interpreter: ---------
Patient: あの，夜中に気分が悪くなって，息ができないくらい苦しくて目が覚めたんです。しかも，ばーって全部もどしてしまって。まだ気分が悪いです。／こんなの初めてだから心配になって，通訳の方を頼んで，できるだけ早く病院に来ました。
Interpreter: ---------
Doctor: I see. I'm going to ask you a series of question about your lifestyle and your activities over the past 24 hours. This may help us pinpoint what's going on. / Firstly, regarding your symptoms, you mention difficulty breathing and vomiting. / Have you also experienced any swelling? / Dizziness? / Sweating? / Anything like a rash?
Interpreter: ---------
Patient: はい，首が少しはれていて，ノドがちょっと詰まった感じです。たぶん，そのせいで息がしづらいんだと思います。／熱はないし，汗もかいていないんですけれど，腕が少し赤くなっていて，ひりひりします。
Interpreter: ---------
Doctor: And what about food? Did you eat anything unusual last night, especially any different types of fruit, vegetable, or nuts? / Perhaps a friend gave you something different to eat, or perhaps you've just eaten something new. / When did you last eat out?
Interpreter: ---------
Patient: あまり外食はしません。でも，時々友達とホームパーティーはします。ここ数日はいつもと違うものは食べていません。職場にはお弁当を持って行きますし，家では家族の分も私が夕食を作っています。／うーん，でも，私以外は誰も具合悪くなっていないし…まったく検討がつきません。
Interpreter: ---------

日英バイリンガルのトランスランゲージング能力育成における会話通訳アクティビティの可能性

小　柴　健　太

要　旨

本稿は，日英バイリンガルのトランスランゲージング能力の育成において会話通訳アクティビティが有効かどうかを検討したものである。三名の日英バイリンガルが会話通訳に取り組む様子を録画したビデオ・データと再生刺激法（stimulated recall interview）を用いて得られたデータをもとに分析を行った。その結果，会話通訳アクティビティは，学生に日本語・英語の両能力を用いることのできる場を提供すると共に，「いつトランスランゲージングをするか」，また「どのようにトランスランゲージングを使ってコミュニケーションの仲介をするか」について考える機会を与えていることがわかった。これらの結果をもとに，本稿は，バイリンガルのトランスランゲージング能力を育成するアクティビティとして会話通訳が有効であるとの結論を提示する。

キーワード：トンラスランゲージング，日本語，翻訳通訳，継承語学習者，教育法